

Critical indices of Anderson transition: something is wrong with numerical results

I. M. Suslov

P.L.Kapitza Institute for Physical problems

117334, Moscow, Russia

E-mail: suslov@kapitza.ras.ru

Abstract

Numerical results for Anderson transition are critically discussed. A simple procedure to deal with corrections to scaling is suggested. With real uncertainties taken into account, the raw data are in agreement with a value $\nu = 1$ for the critical index of the correlation length in three dimensions.

Critical indices s and ν for the conductivity σ and the localization radius ξ of wave functions near the Anderson transition [1] are determined by relations

$$\sigma \sim \tau^s, \quad \xi \sim \tau^{-\nu}, \quad (1)$$

where τ is the dimensionless distance to a critical point. On the modern level, the first estimates of s and ν were given by a scaling theory of localization [2], $s = 1$ and $\nu = 1/\epsilon$ for the space dimensionality $d = 2 + \epsilon$. They suggest that $s \approx \nu \approx 1$ for $d = 3$. A little later, a self-consistent theory of Vollhardt and Wölfle [3] was developed: it gave for arbitrary d [3, 4]

$$s = 1, \quad d > 2; \quad \nu = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{d-2}, & 2 < d < 4 \\ \frac{1}{2}, & d > 4 \end{cases}. \quad (2)$$

These values of indices were in a good agreement with all existing information and suspicion arised that they are exact [5]. Later the present author [6] has suggested a phenomenological scheme, based on the symmetry considerations, that gives (2) without model approximations.

Results based on a nonlinear σ -model [7] agree with (2) on a three-loop level, but the correction of order ϵ^3 appears to be finite [8] and shifts s and ν to much lower values, strikingly spoiling agreement with experimental and numerical results. One should have in mind, however, that correspondence of a nonlinear σ -model with the initial disordered

system *is approximate* and valid only for $d = 2 + \epsilon$ with small ϵ . So it is not surprising if a difference arises in a certain order in ϵ . On the other hand, the high-gradient catastrophe [9] makes the essential modification of the σ -model approach to be inevitable [10].

A value $s = 1$ is in agreement with a large number of experiments [11] but this agreement can be doubted on the ground that the interaction effects are essential in real physical systems. However, attempts to include the interaction in the Vollhardt and Wölfle scheme [12] show that a result (2) can preserve in the systems with interaction. Convincing evidence for $s = 1$ was obtained recently in the experiments with the nondegenerate electron gas [13] where the interaction effects are negligible.

Early numerical results were in a reasonable agreement with (2) ($\nu = 1.2 \pm 0.3$ [14], $\nu = 0.9 \pm 0.3$, $\nu = 1.4 \pm 0.2$ [15]), but later a tendency to the larger values arised: $\nu = 1.35 \pm 0.15$ [16], $\nu = 1.50 \pm 0.15$ [17], $\nu = 1.54 \pm 0.08$ [18], $\nu = 1.45 \pm 0.08$ [19], $\nu = 1.4 \pm 0.15$ [20], $\nu = 1.58 \pm 0.02$ [21]. So large values contradicts to all other information¹ on the critical indices.

It means, in our opinion, that something is wrong with numerical results.

1. To understand it, let us consider d -dependence of the numerical value for ν , which is given by an empirical formula [23]

$$\nu \approx \frac{0.8}{d-2} + 0.5 \quad (3)$$

This formula summarizes results for $d = 3$, $d = 4$ and several noninteger dimensionalities which are realized in the fractal structures. From the theoretical viewpoint, the formula (3) is entirely unsatisfactory:

(a) It gives $\nu = 0.8/\epsilon$ for $d = 2 + \epsilon$, while it should be $\nu = 1/\epsilon$ in any variant of one-parameter scaling: it is a consequence of the fact that the Gell-Mann – Low function has a behavior $\beta(g) = (d-2) + A/g$ for large g , the latter property being proved by a diagrammatic analysis. Of course, one can doubt in validity of one-parameter scaling, but in such case the whole procedure of the data treatment should be dismissed as entirely based on it.

(b) Formula (3) takes into account that $\nu = 1/2$ for high dimensions [24] but suggests the infinite value for the upper critical dimensionality d_{c2} . Such hypothesis arised in the formalism of σ -models, which do not exhibit any special dimension except for $d = 2$ [25]. Once again, it is a consequence of the fact that the σ -model approach is approximate and can be justified only for low dimensions.²

¹ In a recent communication [22] A. Kawabata claims that a value $\nu = 1.58$ can be obtained, if self-consistency of q -dependence of the diffusion coefficient D with L -dependence of conductivity is required. In fact, a solution with $\nu = 1$ is already self-consistent in this sense: it has no q -dependence, but L -dependence of conductivity follows from the temporal dispersion of D [3]. The general analysis shows [6] that only a solution with negligible q -dependence is self-consistent.

² Efetov's derivation [25] of the σ -model is formally valid for arbitrary dimensions but includes the artificial construction of weakly-coupled metallic granules. Such construction and related with it approximations can have unpredictable influence on results.

In the exact field theory formulation, the theory of disordered systems is equivalent to the φ^4 theory with a "wrong" sign of interaction [26, 27]. The latter is renormalizable for $d \leq 4$ and nonrenormalizable for $d > 4$ [28]³. For $d \leq 4$ all of the physics is determined by small momenta or large distances, in accordance with the expected scale invariance. For $d > 4$ the atomic scale cannot be excluded from results and no scale invariance is possible. So the upper critical dimension is surely four and it can be seen from the different viewpoints [30]. So we should expect $\nu = 1/2$ for $d = 4$, but it is in conflict with numerical value $\nu = 1.1 \pm 0.2$ [31], which can be doubted on these grounds. By continuity, the analogous systematic error can be expected for $d = 3$.

2. The most probable reason for a systematic error is the existence of corrections to scaling. All numerical results are based on one-parameter scaling and indeed there are no serious doubt in it for low dimensions. However, there are no indications of the existence of the upper critical dimensionality in the framework of one-parameter scaling. The only possibility to resolve this controversy is to suggest that one of irrelevant parameters becomes relevant at $d = 4$. The corresponding scenario was developed in [32] and resulted in the scale dependence of the conductance which is in agreement with the Vollhardt and Wölfle scheme. There is two-parameter scaling for $d \geq 4$ and a large systematic error for $d = 4$ is rather natural. For $d = 4 - \epsilon$, two-parameter scaling takes place for intermediate scales and the region of its applicability becomes smaller with increase of ϵ . As a consequence, disagreement of numerical results with (2) is less for lower dimensions.

On the model level, corrections to scaling were analysed in [33]. With some assumptions, it appears to be possible to agree the raw data with a value $\nu = 1$.

As it was claimed in [21], with corrections to scaling taken into account, the accuracy of results for ν reaches the level $\sim 1\%$. This statement is extremely doubtful. Authors of [21] carry out nonlinear fitting with 10–12 parameters and present only results but not the procedure used. But in such situation, χ^2 has a great number of different minima (as in a spin glass), and the true one is not necessary the deepest: there are no real possibility to systematize them. Probably, authors of [21] have in mind the minimum, nearest to the fit without scaling corrections. But a problem is, that such fit may be not a good zero approximation.

3. We can suggest a simple procedure to deal with corrections to scaling. As a starting point, we suppose existence of the abstract renormalization group, which is determined by the operator R_s : it corresponds to a change of the length scale by a factor s and transfers one point μ of the parameter space into another point μ' , $\mu' = R_s \mu$ [26]. If μ^* is a fixed point, $\mu^* = R_s \mu^*$, then we have for small $\delta\mu = \mu - \mu^*$

$$\delta\mu = \mu - \mu^* = \sum_i A_i(\tau) \hat{e}_i \quad \text{and} \quad R_s \delta\mu = \sum_i A_i(\tau) s^{y_i} \hat{e}_i, \quad (4)$$

where $\hat{e}_i$ and s^{y_i} are eigenvectors and eigenvalues of the operator R_s , considered as linear

³ Problems of the "wrong" sign of interaction and the replica limit $n \rightarrow 0$ are inessential in the framework of perturbation theory. In fact, renormalizability can be investigated directly in the framework of the "impurity" diagrammatic approach [29], without transition to the effective field theory.

in the vicinity of μ^* [26]. If μ is represented by a set of the coefficients $A_i(\tau)$, then we can write for any quantity Q with a zero scaling dimensionality:

$$Q(\mu) = F \{A_1(\tau)s^{y_1}, A_2(\tau)s^{y_2}, A_3(\tau)s^{y_3}, \dots\} , \quad (5)$$

where $y_1 > y_2 > y_3 > \dots$ and y_1 is related with the critical index ν of the correlation length, $y_1 = 1/\nu$ [26]. If we expand $A_i(\tau)$ near the critical point, $A_i(\tau) = B_i\tau$, we have after redefinition of F

$$Q(\tau, L) = F \{\tau(L/a)^{y_1}, \tau(L/a)^{y_2}, \tau(L/a)^{y_3}, \dots\} , \quad (6)$$

where a length scale L is s times greater than an atomic scale a . For $\tau(L/a)^{y_1} \ll 1$ all arguments of F are small and

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\tau, L) &\approx F \{0, 0, 0, \dots\} + C_1\tau(L/a)^{y_1} + C_2\tau(L/a)^{y_2} + C_3\tau(L/a)^{y_3} + \dots \\ &\equiv F \{0, 0, 0, \dots\} + \tau f(L/a) , \quad \tau(L/a)^{y_1} \ll 1 . \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

In the case of one relevant parameter we have $y_1 > 0$, $y_2, y_3, \dots < 0$ and for large L/a only the first argument in (6) produces essential changes in F , while influence of other parameters are uniformly bounded by a quantity of order τ :⁴

$$Q(\tau, L) \approx F \{\tau(L/a)^{y_1}, 0, 0, \dots\} \equiv G \{\tau(L/a)^{y_1}\} , \quad \tau(L/a)^{y_1} \gtrsim 1 . \quad (8)$$

Now we can unify (7) and (8) into one expression:

$$Q(\tau, L) = G \{\tau f(L/a)\} . \quad (9)$$

A function f has a power-law asymptotics for large L

$$f(L/a) \sim (L/a)^{1/\nu} , \quad L/a \rightarrow \infty \quad (10)$$

and an arbitrary behavior for $L/a \sim 1$, when all terms $C_i\tau(L/a)^{y_i}$ in (7) are of the same order. Nevertheless, dependence of $\ln f(x)$ on $\ln x$ is slow for a wide class of smooth functions and in a restricted interval it can be linearised. So

$$f(L/a) \approx \text{const} (L/a)^{1/\nu_{eff}} \quad (11)$$

and we have a relation

$$Q(\tau, L) = G \{\tau(L/a)^{1/\nu_{eff}}\} = \tilde{G} \{\xi(\tau)/L\} , \quad \xi(\tau) \sim a\tau^{-\nu_{eff}} , \quad (12)$$

which is suggested in all papers involved in the numerical business. At $L \rightarrow \infty$ index ν_{eff} tends to ν , but at finite L it may be essentially different.

Expression (9) is more general than (12) (only $\tau \ll 1$ was suggested) and a simple procedure of the data treatment can be based on it. The most extensive information on

⁴ We assume that a function F and its derivatives are bounded.

the function G can be obtained for a maximum value of L , which is available for us. If we accept $f(L_{max}/a) = 1$, fixing the scale of the argument of G , we have

$$G\{\tau\} = Q(\tau, L_{max}) . \quad (13)$$

If $Q(\tau, L)$ is known for a set of the scales L_i , the formula (9) determines $f(x)$ in the points L_i/a : we should fit the scale τ_i to a relation $G\{\tau/\tau_i\} \approx Q(\tau, L_i)$ and put $f(L_i/a) = 1/\tau_i$ after that. Such procedure makes it possible to extract the true function $f(L/a)$, not assuming a power-law dependence for it. Its behavior for $L \sim L_{max}$ gives the most reliable estimate of ν , that can be obtained from the existing data.

4. As an illustration, let us discuss the interpretation of the largest scale data, existing for the Anderson transition. The largest system size $L = 100$ was used in [20] (we accept $a = 1$ in what follows), but the suitable data are available only for $L \leq 28$. The most detailed of them are presented in Fig. 4 of [20], where a scaling quantity A is plotted against the amplitude of disorder W for $L = 28, 12, 6$; we consider A as $Q(\tau, L)$ with $\tau = (W - W_c)/W_c$, where W_c is a critical disorder.

Theoretically, the simplest procedure (in fact, it was used in [20]) can be based on the formula (7), which determined $f(L/a)$ as a slope of a linear dependence Q on τ at $\tau \rightarrow 0$. In practice, for sufficiently small τ one should take a difference of two close quantities with a great loss of accuracy, while for a moderately small τ it is difficult to control the validity of (7). As one can see in Fig. 4 of [20], dependence Q on τ is only approximately close to linear, but in fact it is an essentially broken line. To demonstrate a situation, we give in a Table an average slope of dependence Q on τ and its fluctuations in the interval $16 < W < 17$, which corresponds to a condition $\tau(L/a)^{1/\nu} \lesssim 1$.

T a b l e
Slope of dependence Q on τ (arbitrary units)

	$L = 28$	$L = 12$	$L = 6$
Average value	0.30	0.16	0.10
Least value for $16 < W < 17$	0.20	0.10	0.04
Largest value for $16 < W < 17$	0.42	0.25	0.12

With the use of the average slope, we indeed obtain $\nu \approx 1.4$, as it was reported in [20]. With real uncertainties taken into account, we can have any value of ν in the interval $0.7 \div 3.0$. Authors of [20] give essentially smaller error, relying on the averaging procedure. But one can see by eye in Fig 4 of [20], that any value, given in Table 1, has a reasonable probability to be a true slope at $\tau = 0$. Statistical treatment cannot improve this situation, but can give only an illusion of doing it.

More stable results can be obtained with the use of a formula (9). If we accept $f(28) = 1$ and take $Q(\tau, 28)$ as $G(\tau)$, we can find a scaling factor τ_i for each experimental point for $L = 12$ and $L = 6$. For a function $f(x)$ we have

$$f(12) = 0.33 \div 0.65, \quad f(6) = 0.14 \div 0.40 \quad (14)$$

and after averaging

$$\langle f(12) \rangle = 0.52, \quad \langle f(6) \rangle = 0.28. \quad (15)$$

One can see in Fig. 1, that the most probable value is $\nu = 1.25$, and it is essentially shifted⁵ in comparison with $\nu = 1.4$ given in [20]. With the total uncertainty taken into account, we have $\nu = 0.8 \div 1.7$ and a value $\nu = 1$ is admissible.

Uncertainties of results can be formally diminished, if we interpret an error in the mean square deviation or another sense. However, it requires some statistical hypothesis concerning a distribution of errors, which hardly can be justified in view of their partially systematic nature.

5. An effective index ν_{eff} in (11,12) tends to ν in the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$. For the moderate L , a good accuracy of approximations (11,12) does not mean, in general, that ν_{eff} is really close to ν . A well known example is the second order transition with a small Ginzburg number, where a new scale $\xi_0 \gg a$ arises: the true critical indices are observed only for $L \gtrsim \xi_0$, while for $L \lesssim \xi_0$ the relations (11,12) are valid with a mean-field value of ν_{eff} . In fact, convergence ν_{eff} to ν can be slow even in the absence of such new scale. Evidently, there are no rigorous procedure to control a difference $\nu_{eff} - \nu$.

All numerical estimates of ν are systematically greater than unity and, beyond any doubt, it reflects a realistic behavior of $f(L/a)$ in the corresponding range of scales. A function $f(L/a)$ is not universal and depends on the choice of a model. One should have in mind, however, that one and the same model is investigated in all papers: it is the Anderson model with a transition in the center of the band. Differences in the form of distribution of site energies (f.e. box or Gaussian) are of minor importance: a critical value of W is large, and near the band center this distribution looks as practically uniform. To have a real estimate of a systematic error, one should shift to a band edge and use the different procedures to reach a critical point (f.e. by change of energy or disorder). The only attempt of this kind was undertaken in [15] and resulted in essential decrease of ν with increase of uncertainties. It is desirable to repeat such attempt on the higher level of accuracy.

In conclusion, we have demonstrated, that even the most detailed and largest scale data can be reinterpreted with an essential shift of results. As for the systems of smaller size, the results can be doubted simply on the ground, that the function $f(L/a)$ does not reach its asymptotic regime (10). As for a systematic error, nobody can say nothing definite about it⁶.

⁵ The origin of this systematic shift is rather simple. The function $Q(\tau)$ is linear for small τ but grows more slowly, something like $|\tau|^\alpha \text{sign} \tau$ with $\alpha < 1$, for larger τ . If the latter dependence is approximated by linear one, using values for $\tau = \tau_0$ and $\tau = -\tau_0$, the slope $\sim \tau_0^\alpha$ is obtained. After a scale transformation $\tau \rightarrow \tau(L/a)^{1/\nu}$ this slope has dependence $(L/a)^{\alpha/\nu}$, which is interpreted as $(L/a)^{1/\nu_{eff}}$ with $\nu_{eff} = \nu/\alpha > \nu$. Such effect is present in the most of papers.

⁶ The most extremistic values of ν [18, 21] are obtained in the case of small L and high accuracy. It is exactly the situation, when a statistical error is small, while a systematic one is large. Surely, the given accuracy reflects only the first of them.

The author is grateful to M. V. Sadovskii for critical remarks.

This work was financially supported by INTAS (Grant 99-1070) and the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (Project 00-02-17129).

References

- [1] P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **109**, 1492 (1958).
- [2] E. Abrahams, P. W. Anderson, D. C. Licciardello, T. V. Ramakrishnan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **42**, 673 (1979).
- [3] D. Vollhardt, P. Wölfle, Phys. Rev. B **22**, 4666 (1980); Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 699 (1982).
D. Vollhardt, P. Wölfle, in Modern Problems in Condensed Matter Sciences, ed. by V. M. Agranovich and A. A. Maradudin, v. 32, North-Holland, Amsterdam (1992).
- [4] A. Kawabata, Solid State Commun. **38**, 823 (1981).
B. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. B **25**, 4266 (1982).
A. V. Myasnikov, M. V. Sadovskii, Fiz. Tverd. Tela (Leningrad) **34**, 3569 (1982).
- [5] H. Kunz, R. Souillard, J. de Phys. Lett. **44**, L506 (1983).
- [6] I. M. Suslov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **108**, 1686 (1995) [JETP **81**, 925 (1995)].
- [7] F. Wegner, Z. Phys. B **35**, 207 (1979); L. Schäfer, F. Wegner, Z. Phys. B **38**, 113 (1980).
K. B. Efetov, A. I. Larkin, D. E. Khmelnitskii, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **79**, 1120 (1980) [Sov. Phys. JETP **52**, 568 (1980)].
K. B. Efetov, Adv. Phys. **32**, 53 (1983).
- [8] F. Wegner, Nucl. Phys. B **316**, 663 (1989).
- [9] V. E. Kravtsov, I. V. Lerner, V. I. Yudson, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **94**, 255 (1988) [Sov. Phys. JETP **67**, 1441 (1988)].
F. Wegner, Z. Phys. B **78**, 33 (1990).
- [10] B. A. Muzykantskii, D. E. Khmelnitskii, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **62**, 68 (1995) [JETP Letters **62**, 76 (1995)].
- [11] D. Belitz, T. R. Kirkpatrick, Rev. Mod. Phys., **66**, 261 (1994).
- [12] E. Z. Kuchinskii, M. V. Sadovskii, V. G. Suvorov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **107**, 2027 (1995) [JETP **80**, 1122 (1995)].
- [13] N. G. Zhdanova, M. S. Kagan, E. G. Landsberg, JETP **90**, 662 (2000)

- [14] A. MacKinnon, B. Kramer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 1546 (1981).
- [15] B. Kramer, K. Broderix, A. MacKinnon, M. Schreiber, Physica A **167**, 163 (1990).
- [16] E. Hofstetter, M. Schreiber, Europhys. Lett. **21**, 933 (1993).
- [17] B. I. Shklovskii, B. Shapiro, B. R. Sears et al, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 11487 (1993).
- [18] A. MacKinnon, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **6**, 2511 (1994).
- [19] I. Kh. Zharekeshev, B. Kramer, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 17 239 (1995).
- [20] I. Kh. Zharekeshev, B. Kramer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 717 (1997).
- [21] K. Slevin, T. Ohtsuki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 382 (1999).
- [22] A. Kawabata, cond-mat/0104289
- [23] M. Schreiber, H. Grussbach, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 1687 (1996).
- [24] H. Kunz, R. Souillard, J. de Phys. Lett. **44**, L411 (1983).
K. B. Efetov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **93**, 1125 (1987) [Sov. Phys. JETP **66**, 634 (1987)].
K. B. Efetov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **94**, 357 (1988) [Sov. Phys. JETP **67**, 199 (1988)].
- [25] K. B. Efetov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **88**, 1032 (1985) [Sov. Phys. JETP **61**, 606 (1985)].
A. D. Mirlin, Y.V.Fyodorov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 526 (1994).
- [26] Ma S., Modern Theory of Critical Phenomena, Reading, Mass.: W.A.Benjamin, Advanced Book Program, 1976.
- [27] A. Nitzan, K. F. Freed, M. N. Cohen, Phys. Rev. B **15**, 4476 (1977).
- [28] N. N. Bogolyubov, D. V. Shirkov, Introduction to the Theory of Quantized Fields, New York: John Wiley, 1980.
E. Brezin, J. C. Le Guillou, J. Zinn-Justin, in Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena, ed. by C. Domb and M. S. Green, Academic, New York (1976), Vol. VI.
- [29] A. A. Abrikosov, L. P. Gor'kov, I. E. Dzyaloshinskii, Quantum Field Theoretical Methods in Statistical Physics, Oxford, New York: Pergamon Press, 1965.
- [30] I. M. Suslov, Usp. Fiz. Nauk **168**, 503 (1998) [Physics-Uspekhi **41**, 441 (1998)].
- [31] I. Kh. Zharekeshev, B. Kramer, Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) **7**, 442 (1998).
- [32] I. M. Suslov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **113**, 1460 (1998) [JETP **86**, 798 (1998)].
- [33] E. N. Economou, C. M. Soukoulis, A.D. Zdetsis, Phys. Rev. B **31**, 6483 (1985).
H. Kroha, Physica A **167**, 231 (1990).

